

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA**

Stacie G.,) C/A No.: 1:25-cv-0182 DCN
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 vs.) **ORDER**
)
 Frank Bisignano, Commissioner of Social)
 Security Administration,)
)
 Defendant.)
)

The above-referenced case is before this court upon the magistrate judge's recommendation that the Commissioner's decision be reversed and remanded pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative proceedings.

This court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the magistrate judge’s report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). However, absent prompt objection by a dissatisfied party, it appears that Congress did not intend for the district court to review the factual and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140 (1985). Additionally, any party who fails to file timely, written objections to the magistrate judge’s report pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) waives the right to raise those objections at the appellate court level. United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984), ert. denied, 467 U.S. 1208 (1984).¹ **As of the date of this order, no objections have been filed.**

¹ In Wright v Collins, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985), the court held “that a pro se litigant must receive fair notification of the consequences of failure to object to a magistrate judge’s report before such a procedural default will result in waiver of the right to appeal. The notice must be ‘sufficiently understandable to one in appellant’s circumstances fairly to apprise him of what is required.’” Id at 846. Plaintiff was advised in a clear manner that his objections had to be filed

A de novo review of the record indicates that the magistrate judge's report accurately summarizes this case and the applicable law. Accordingly, the magistrate judge's report and recommendation is **ADOPTED** and incorporated into this order. For the reasons articulated by the magistrate judge, the Commissioner's decision is hereby **REVERSED AND REMANDED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) for further administrative proceedings as set forth in the Report and Recommendation.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



David C. Norton
United States District Judge

July 17, 2025
Charleston, South Carolina

within fourteen (14) days, and he received notice of the consequences at the appellate level of his failure to object to the magistrate judge's report.